



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,282	11/20/2003	Koji Tanonaka	02-51786	3194
79326	7590	07/06/2009		
Fujitsu Patent Center C/O CPA Global P.O. Box 52050 Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER NAJEE-ULLAH, TARIQ S	
			ART UNIT 2453	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,282

Applicant(s)

TANONAKA, KOJI

Examiner

TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 7, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. This Office action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed May 7, 2009. Claims 1-9 are pending in the case. No claims have been canceled or added. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,618,455 to Maeda et al (Maeda hereinafter) in view of US Patent No. 6,816,818 to Wolf et al (Wolf hereinafter have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Priority

4. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the

foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 4 recites "a node apparatus conforming to a given one of a first synchronization scheme and a second synchronization scheme...comprising a receiving unit...and a synchronous state indication code converting unit." As presented in the claim language, the apparatus is not limited to any statutory hardware elements and is considered software. An apparatus containing software is considered a program per se and is non-statutory. As such claim 4 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 5-9 are rejected because they depend from claim 4 and as such are considered non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,618,455 to Maeda et al (Maeda hereinafter) in view of US 2004/0208568 to Sweeney et al (Sweeney hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Maeda teaches **a synchronous network establishing method of establishing a synchronous network in which a node apparatus conforming to a first synchronization scheme and a node apparatus conforming to a second synchronization scheme co-reside** (Maeda, col. 1, line 60 – col. 2, line 16). Maeda does not explicitly teach **wherein the first synchronization scheme and the second synchronization scheme implement different synchronous state indication codes for establishing the synchronous network, said method comprising: receiving a first state indication code used by the first synchronization scheme to indicate a state of a clock signal with respect to each of a plurality of clock signals employed in the first synchronization scheme; converting the first synchronous state indication code used by the first synchronization scheme into a second synchronous state indication code used by the second synchronization scheme when the node apparatus conforming to the second synchronization scheme receives the first synchronous state indication code from the node apparatus conforming to the first synchronization scheme, the second synchronous state indication code being used by the second synchronization scheme to indicate a state of a clock signal with respect to each of the plurality of clock signals employed in the second synchronization scheme.**

Sweeney teaches **wherein the first synchronization scheme and the second synchronization scheme implement different synchronous state indication codes for establishing the synchronous network** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43; fig. 2), **said method comprising: receiving a first state indication code used by the first synchronization scheme to indicate a state of a clock signal with respect to each of a plurality of clock signals employed in the first synchronization scheme** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2); **converting the first synchronous state indication code used by the first synchronization scheme into a second synchronous state indication code used by the second synchronization** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2) **scheme when the node apparatus conforming to the second synchronization scheme receives the first synchronous state indication code from the node apparatus conforming to the first synchronization scheme** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2), **the second synchronous state indication code being used by the second synchronization scheme to indicate a state of a clock signal** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2) **with respect to each of the plurality of clock signals employed in the second synchronization scheme** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2).

To provide the method of Maeda with additional functionality of converting the SDH to SONET or vice-versa would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Sweeney, since all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would

have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claim 2, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1 above including, **further comprising including the first synchronous state indication code that is supplied from the node apparatus conforming to one of the first scheme and the second scheme in an empty bit (Maeda, fig. 2, col. 5, line 37-56) of the converted second synchronous state indication code** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43; fig. 2).

Regarding claim 3, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 1 above including, **further comprising using a pre-converted synchronous state indication code included in an empty bit (Maeda, fig. 2, col. 5, line 37-56) of the first synchronous state indication code that is supplied from the node apparatus conforming to one of the first scheme and the second scheme** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43, 62; fig. 2).

Regarding claim 5, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 4 above including, **further comprising: a selecting unit to select one of the synchronous state indication code supplied from the counterpart node apparatus (Maeda, fig. 16, col. 4, line 27-61) and the converted synchronous state indication code obtained by the synchronous state indication code converting unit** (Sweeney, ¶ 27, 43; fig. 2).

Regarding claim 6, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **wherein the selecting unit administers**

switching according to a switching instruction signal (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 35).

Regarding claim 7, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **further comprising: a switch unit to instruct a switching of the selecting unit** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 35).

Regarding claim 8, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 5 above including, **further comprising: a switching instruction unit to detect a bit of a signal supplied from the counterpart node apparatus to determine which of the first scheme and the second scheme said counterpart node apparatus conforms to, and to instruct a switching of the selecting unit based on the determination** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 61).

Regarding claim 9, Maeda-Wolf discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 4 above including, **wherein a content to be converted by the synchronous state indication code converting unit can be arbitrarily changed** (Maeda, clock switching unit, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 61).

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, in an effort to better place the claims in condition for allowance, Examiner encourages further modification of claim language to include language that is more precisely descriptive and provides a more clear representation of what the

Applicant presents as the invention in the specification in a manner which overcomes the prior art as presented. Examiner also reminds Applicant that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US 2003/0112833 and 7,042,904 to Kamiya; US 7,099,579 to Sweeney et al; US 7,245,633 to Mueller.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH whose telephone number is (571)270-5013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tariq S Najee-ullah/
Acting Examiner of Art Unit 2453
July 2, 2009

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453